

Applic. No. 10/573,539
Amdt. dated December 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 14-21 and 23-31 remain in the application. Claims 14, 17-21, and 23-30 have been amended. Claim 22 is being cancelled herewith.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 14 and 22-31 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) (hereinafter "Yamada") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and as a whole, the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application, claim 14 has been amended so as to include the subject matter of claim 22.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Applic. No. 10/573,539
Amdt. dated December 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2007

Claim 14 calls for, *inter alia*:

the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region and the thick region being implemented as a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks.

On page 2 of the Office action the Examiner alleges that Yamada discloses circuit carrier having a "thick region (21') supporting a "thin region (5')".

The Yamada reference discloses a flexible wiring board (5) and a stepped wiring board (21).

In the penultimate paragraph on page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner alleges that Yamada discloses that "the thin region and the thick region are implemented as a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks".

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner is in error. Particularly, Yamada does not disclose a circuit carrier having a thin region and a thick region that is implemented as a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks. Yamada discloses a flexible wiring board (5) and a stepped

Applic. No. 10/573,539
Amdt. dated December 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2007

wiring board (21). Yamada does not disclose that the flexible wiring board (5) and the stepped wiring board (21), are molded interconnect devices. Therefore, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation pertaining to a molded interconnect device, are not accurate.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show the circuit carrier having at least one relatively thin region and a relatively thick region supporting the thin region, the thin region and the thick region being implemented as a molded interconnect device with integrated conductor tracks, as recited in claim 14 of the instant application.

The present invention as claimed with the thick and thin regions being a molded interconnect device provides the advantage of a higher degree of freedom and a higher accuracy in defining the recesses. This in turn increases the accuracy of the adjustment.

Since claim 1 is allowable over Yamada, dependent claims 23-31 are allowable over Yamada as well.

In the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 14, 16-19, and 21 have been rejected as being fully

Applic. No. 10/573,539
Amdt. dated December 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2007

anticipated by Hoshino et al. (EP 1081944 A2) (hereinafter
"Hoshino") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As noted above, claim 14 has been amended to include the
subject matter of claim 22. Since claim 22 was not rejected
over Hoshino, claim 14 is allowable over Hoshino. Since claim
14 is allowable over Hoshino, dependent claims 16-19 and 21
are allowable over Hoshino as well.

In the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim
15 has been rejected as being obvious over Yamada (U.S. Patent
Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) in view of
Nakajoh (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025825
A1) (hereinafter "Nakajoh") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Nakajoh
does not make up for the deficiencies of Yamada. Since claim
14 is allowable, dependent claim 15 is allowable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim 20
has been rejected as being obvious over Yamada (U.S. Patent
Application Publication No. 2001/0050717 A1) in view of
Kothmeier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.
2003/0193609 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Kothmeier does not
make up for the deficiencies of Yamada. Since claim 14 is
allowable, dependent claim 20 is allowable as well.

Applic. No. 10/573,539
Amdt. dated December 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2007

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 14. Claim 14 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 14, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 14-21 and 23-31 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/573,539
Amdt. dated December 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 2, 2007

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

December 27, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101